



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/465,514	12/16/1999	HENRY M. GLADNEY	A7254	8969
7590	11/10/2003		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W WASHINGTON, DC 200373213			HA, LEYNNA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	3
DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/465,514	GLADNEY, HENRY M.	
	Examiner LEYNNA T. HA	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-37 have been examined and rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).
2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph.
3. Minor informalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. ***The term "unique" in claims 1,6,10,17, and 22 are a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "unique" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.***

Claims 1, 6, 10, 17, and 22, include the term “unique”. The Examiner ascertains the term “unique” is motivated to describe how different (an identifier) it can be but fails to maintain to a requisite degree therefore, “unique” is a relative term. ***All other claims are rejected by virtue of their dependency.***

5. Claims 17 and 22 provides for the use of “the method comprising requesting access for a user to a remote resource”, **but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass.** A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example Ex parte Dunki, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

The Examiner asserts that Applicant only disclosed a single means for claims 17 and 22. Applicant fails to disclose all the possible means of claims 17 and 22, such as means for “requesting access”, means for creating the “subject identifier”, means for “making an access control decision”, and means for which “identifies the user”.

All other claims are also rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito (US 6,076,077).

As per claim 1:

Saito discloses a storage system comprising:

a first storage area having an object stored therein; and [see col.1, line 30 thru col.2, line 56]

a second storage area having stored therein an object identifier that identifies the object, wherein the object identifier is unique within and outside of the storage system. [see col.4, lines 19-25]

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 2:

Saito discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). [see col.4, line 63-col.5, line 6]

As per claim 3:

Saito discloses the first and second storage areas are storage areas within a database. [see col.5, lines 12-65]

As per claim 4: Saito discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). [see col.4, line 63 thru col.5, line 6]

As per claim 5:

Saito discloses the storage system is part of an access control system. [see col.3, lines 49-54]

As per claim 6:

Saito discloses a memory comprising:

a first storage area having an object stored therein; and [see col.1, line 30 thru col.2, line 56]

a second storage area having stored therein an object identifier that identifies the object, wherein the object identifier is unique within and outside of the storage system. [see col.4, lines 19-25]

As per claim 7: Saito discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). [see col.4, line 63 thru col.5, line 6]

As per claim 8: Saito discloses the first and second storage areas are storage areas within a database. [see col.5, lines 12-65]

As per claim 9: Saito discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). **[see col.4, line 63 thru col.5, line 6]**

As per claim 10:

Saito discloses a method of storing information in a storage system, comprising:

storing an object in the storage system; and **[see col.1, line 30 thru col.2, line 56]**

storing an object identifier in the storage system, wherein the object identifier identifies the object, and the object identifier is unique within and outside of the storage system. **[col.4, lines 19-25]**

As per claim 11: as rejected on the same rationale as applied in claim 2.

As per claim 12:

Saito teaches the object identifier is stored in a database. **[see col.5, lines 12-65]**

As per claim 13: as rejected on the same rationale as applied in claim 12.

As per claim 14: Saito discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). **[see col.4, line 63-col.5, line 6]**

As per claim 15: Saito discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). **[see col.4, line 63-col.5, line 6]**

As per claim 16: Saito discloses the storage system is part of an access control system. **[see col.3, lines 49-54]**

6. Claims 17-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sonderreger (US 5,893,118).

As per claim 17:

Sonderegger discloses an access control method comprising:
requesting access for a user to a remote resource, wherein the request includes a subject identifier for use in making an access control decision, and wherein the subject identifier is unique within and outside of the remote resource and identifies the user. **[see col.8 lines 30-55]**

As per claim 18:

Sonderegger discloses the subject identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). **[see col.7, lines 30-35 and col.9, lines 9-12]**

As per claim 19:

Saito discusses the request further includes a subject descriptor for use in the access control decision. **[see col.3, line 64 thru col.4, line 10]**

As per claim 20:

Saito discusses the subject descriptor is a UUID for an organizational structure that includes the user. **[col.9, lines 5-12]**

As per claim 21:

Saito discusses the access control decision is made by a resource manager that protects the remote resource, and the request is sent over a communications path considered safe by the protecting resource manager and the user.

[see col.7, line 62 thru col.8, line 3 and FIG.1]

As per claim 22:

Sonderegger discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable code stored thereon comprising:

requesting access for a user to a remote resource, wherein the request includes a subject identifier for use in making an access control decision, and wherein the subject identifier is unique within and outside of the remote resource and identifies the user. **[see FIGs. 7 and 8]**

As per claim 23: as rejected on the same rationale as applied in claim 18.

As per claim 24:

Sonderegger discloses a method of identifying a user requesting access to an object, comprising:

establishing a secure communication path between a reference monitor protecting the object and a resource manager having information describing the user, in response to a request by the user to access the object;

[see col.7, line 50 thru col.8, line 67 and FIGs. 7-8]

sending a request for user information from the protecting reference monitor to the resource manager, the request including a subject descriptor for the user, wherein the subject identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier UUUID).

[see col.7 lines 30-35]

As per claim 25:

Sonderegger discloses determining, based on the received user information, if the user has permission to access the request object. **[see col.10 lines 48-67]**

As per claim 26:

Sonderegger discloses the user information includes information relating to an organization of which the user is member. **[see col.9 lines 9-10 and FIG.7]**

As per claim 27:

Sonderegger discloses an information storage management system, comprising:

a collection of stored objects; **[see col.8, lines 11-14]**

an access control unit for determining if a requestor is authorized to access a protected object stored in the collection; **[see col.10, line 58 thru col.11, line 5 and FIG.8]**

a resource manager connected to the access control unit and to a communication channel; **[see FIG.1]**

wherein the resource manager receives a user's request for access to the protected object, the request including a globally unique identifier for the user requesting the access, and in response to the user's request the resource manager sends over the communications channel to an external storage management system a request for information about the user, the request including the globally unique identifier; and **[see col.9, lines 10 thru col.11, line 66]**

wherein the resource manager upon receiving a response including user information about the user passes the user information to the access control unit; and based on the user information the access control unit determines

whether to grant the subject access to the protected object. [see col.10 lines 59-66 and FIG.8]

As per claim 28:

Sonderegger discloses the globally unique identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). [see col.7, lines 30-35 and col.9, lines 9-12]

As per claim 29:

Sonderegger discloses the user information is organization information indicating whether the user is a member of an organization. [see col.10 lines 60-65]

As per claim 30:

Sonderegger discloses an information storage management system, comprising:

a collection of stored objects; [see col.8, lines 11-14]

an access control unit for determining if a requestor is authorized to access a protected object stored in the collection; [see col.10, line 58 thru col.11, line 5 and FIG.8]

a resource manager connected to the access control unit and to a communication channel; [see FIG.1]

wherein the resource manager receives a user's request for access to the protected object, the request including a globally unique identifier for the user requesting the access, and in response to the user's request the resource manager resolves the globally unique identifier to an user identifier recognized by an external storage management system; the resource manager sending to

the external storage management system a request for information about the user, the request including the resolved user identifier; and [see col.9, lines 10 thru col.11, line 66]

wherein the resource manager upon receiving a response including user information about the user passes the user information to the access control unit; and based on the user information the access control unit determines whether to grant the subject access to the protected object. [see col.10 lines 59-66 and FIG.8]

As per claim 31:

Sonderegger discloses the globally unique identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). [see col.9, lines 9-11]

As per claim 32:

Sonderegger discloses the user information is organization information indicating whether the user is a member of an organization. [see col.10 lines 60-65]

As per claim 33:

Sonderegger discloses the resource manager resolves the globally unique identifier by using a name server. [see col.6, lines 46-53]

As per claim 34:

Sonderegger discloses a method of accessing a protected object, comprising:

sending a globally unique identifier for a user to a name resolving device, and receiving therefrom information about the user; and [see col.9, lines 9-11]

sending to a storage management system containing an object a request for access to the object, the request including the information about the user.

[see col.8, lines 11-66]

As per claim 35: as rejected on the same rationale as applied in claim 31.

As per claim 36:

Sonderegger discloses a computer-readable medium of computer-executable code for accessing a protected object, comprising:

a first set of computer instructions for sending a globally unique identifier for a user to a name resolving device, and receiving therefrom information about the user; and **[see col.9, lines 9-67]**

a second set of computer instructions for sending to a storage management system containing an object a request for access to the object, the request including the information about the user. **[see col.8, lines 11-66]**

As per claim 37: as rejected on the same rationale as applied in claim 31.

MINOR INFORMALITIES

7. *Claims 3, 34, and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities:*

Claim 3 needs an ending quotation such as a “.” (period).

Claim 30 on line 10, states “**an** user identifier” should be “a user identifier”.

Claims 34 and 36, with the term "**therefrom**" should be two words (i.e. "there from").

Appropriate correction is required.

Conclusion

** For further details and descriptions of the rejections above, please refer to:

Saito (US 6,076,077): see col.3, line 1, Et. Seq. and Figures 1-7.

Sonderegger (US 5,893,118): see col.5, Et. Seq. and Figures 1-8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEYNNA T. HA whose telephone number is (703) 305-3853. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AYAZ SHEIKH can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Lha


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100